REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed June 24, 2009, has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-25 are rejected. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12, 14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKay (US 2003/0217111) in view of Woltzen (US 2003/0197735) and further in view of Microsoft Windows XP Professional 2002 (hereinafter Windows XP). Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKay (US 2003/0217111) in view of Microsoft Windows XP Professional 2002 (hereinafter Windows XP) further in view of Woltzen (US 2003/0197735) and further in view of Paulsen (US 7,062,511). Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulsen (US 7,062,511) in view of Microsoft Windows XP Professional 2002 (hereinafter Windows XP) and further in view of Woltzen (US 2003/0197735).

With regard to Claim 1, the Office Action recites that McKay teaches "a. selecting an element (tab) from a navigational hierarchy, the selected element being associated with a location accessible from the portal, the navigational hierarchy being identified with metadata in a database (page 12, paragraph 122/page 8, paragraph 96), McKay discloses selecting an interaction to be performed on the selected element (page 12, paragraph 123), but does not explicitly disclose the selecting is performed at an interface for modifying metadata associated with the element and accessing the location associated with the element, wherein the interface includes a menu displayed in association with the selected element of the navigational hierarchy, the menu including actions for modifying metadata of the selected element, and wherein the menu is superimposed over a portion of the navigational hierarchy. Windows XP discloses an interface for modifying metadata (control panel) which includes a menu that contains actions to modify metadata (rename) of the selected element, wherein the menu is superimposed over a

portion of the navigational hierarchy (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the functionality of an interface which allows a user to modify metadata including a menu in the method disclosed by McKay. One would have been motivated to include this limitation in order to provide the user with customization capabilities. c. retrieving metadata associated with the selected interaction and the selected element (page 8, paragraph 96).

McKay does not explicitly disclose determining whether the selected interaction corresponds to an action to modify the metadata by distinguishing between an action to modify metadata and a navigational interaction wherein the location being displayed is displayed simultaneously with the user interface for modifying metadata and the user interface for accessing the location. Woltzen discloses a similar system that further discloses an interface which allows a user to navigate to access locations using tabs and for modifying metadata (Figure 3; '54', tab management tools). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to distinguish between an action to modify metadata and a navigational interaction wherein the location being displayed is displayed simultaneously with the user interface for modifying metadata and the user interface for accessing the location in McKay. One would have been motivated to include this feature in order to allow the user to modify interface content.

d. accessing the location from the portal in response to selection of a feature associated with the interaction when the interaction does not correspond to an action (page 12, paragraph 123). Windows XP discloses when the interaction selected at the interface for modifying metadata associated with the element and accessing the location associated with the element corresponds to an action to modify the metadata, performing the action with the retrieved metadata and updating the metadata in the database based on the performed action. Particularly, Windows XP discloses providing a user the ability to edit the name of a category (Figure 1; rename My Documents). It is obvious that the metadata is updated in the database in order to save the changes that the administrator has made to the navigational hierarchy. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made that if an interaction corresponds to an action to modify the metadata, performing the action with the retrieved metadata and updating the metadata in the database based on the performed action in <u>McKay.</u> One would have been motivated to modify the metadata for customization purposes." In response, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

As amended, Claim 1 recites in part "displaying areas and subareas within a navigational hierarchy for the portal; wherein the areas are located at a first level within the hierarchy and the subareas are located at a second level within the hierarchy; wherein the second level is a lower level within the hierarchy then the first level; wherein the areas and subareas that are displayed depend upon security settings associated with the user viewing the portal; wherein the areas and the subareas are elements within the navigational hierarchy; wherein security settings for a child element inherit security settings from the parent; receiving a selection of an element from the navigational hierarchy, the selected element being associated with a location accessible from the portal, the navigational hierarchy being identified with metadata in a database." Among other differences, the cited references do not teach selectively displaying elements within the display of the portal or the inheritance of security settings between elements at different levels within the hierarchy.

In contrast, McKay is directed at displaying health information to users. McKay teaches that different information is selected by the selection of a tab. Paragraph 122 of McKay recites in part "The information is displayed in a clear logical manner. Notice data bar 1402 at the top of the results list with the Patient Name and Age and Admitting diagnosis. Practitioner looks at the four options (1404) from which to choose: Bedside Chart, Radiology Results, Laboratory Results and Medical Records." Referring to Figure 14 of McKay it can be seen that different tabs are used to select the four different options. These tabs, however, are not a hierarchical display of elements at different hierarchical examples. Further, McKay does not teach that different elements within the navigational structure are displayed based on the security settings for a user viewing the portal display. Still yet, McKay does not teach that child elements inherit security settings from the parent element within the navigational display. The addition of the other cited

references fail to cure these deficiencies. For example, Woltzen discloses the ability to add, edit or delete tabs (see FIGURE 3). A tab interface, however, is not hierarchical as defined within Claim 1. Tabs are displayed adjacent to each other at the same level; tabs are not displayed in a hierarchy. Since Woltzen does not describe a hierarchy of elements it is impossible to disclose that child elements inherit security settings from a parent element. Further, the Windows XP reference does not teach that elements inherit security settings from parent elements or that elements are displayed based on a user's security. Instead, the Windows XP reference shows only that security settings may be set for a single element within the display. For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 2-20 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

As amended, Claim 21 recites in part "displaying on a first user interface a navigational hierarchy of the elements accessible from the portal, wherein the elements displayed are selected in response to security settings associated with a user viewing the display; wherein the navigational hierarchy comprises elements that are located at a first level within the hierarchy and elements that are located at a second level within the hierarchy; wherein the second level is a lower level within the hierarchy then the first level; wherein security settings for an element at the second level inherit security settings from a parent element at the first level." For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 21 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 22-25 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
206.342.6200

/Timothy P. Sullivan/
Timothy P. Sullivan
Reg. No. 47,981
Direct Dial 206.342.6254

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE